

Public Document Pack



MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 5 NOVEMBER 2013

Members Present: Councillors Serluca (Chairman), Harper (Vice Chairman), Hiller, Todd, Simons, Sylvester, Ash, and Harrington

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Group Manager Development Management
Carrie Denness, Senior Solicitor
Hannah Vincent, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development), Highway Control
Karen S Dunleavy, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lane, Councillor Shabbir and Councillor North.

Councillor Ash was in attendance as a substitute.

2. Declarations of Interests

There were no declaration of interest.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 October 2013

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2013 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

4.1 13/01478/PRIOR – Single Storey Rear Extension, 48 Hall Lane, Werrington, Peterborough, PE4 6RA

The site was host to a large detached bungalow facing onto Hall Lane Werrington. The dwelling was single story, constructed of red/brown facing brick, a dark brown concrete tile roof and brown timber windows and doors. The rear garden was laid to lawn with a detached garage to the back of the site, accessed via a road to the rear of the site.

The proposal was for prior approval for a single storey rear extension to the bungalow. The extension would measure 6230mm (projection) x 4300mm (width). The eaves of the proposal would measure 2350mm and 3900mm to the ridge. The extension would form a brick built lounge/sunroom with two roof lights in each roof slope, high level windows in the south elevation which faced the shared boundary with no.46 Hall Lane, with the north facing elevation being mostly glazed.

The Committee was requested to consider the permitted development with a view to approving the extra 2.2 metres of the development. The Group Manager Development Management drew the Committees attention to the updated information and photographs contained within the update report which outlined the removal of the proposed two high level windows.

The officer recommendation was to grant the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

Councillor Paula Thacker, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposed extension would be situated too near number 46 Hall Lane's fence, with the height causing the main concern;
- The residents of 46 Hall Lane had lived in their house for 20 years and the extension would have a dramatic impact on them, as it would impact on their view;
- The proposed extension was out of character compared to other dwellings in Hall Lane;
- No compromise could be negotiated between the neighbours; and
- The Committee should consider rejecting the application under policies CS16 and PP03.

Mr and Mrs Alexander, local residents, addressed the Committee and responded questions by Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposed extension would be more visible from number 46 Hall Lane;
- The photo mock ups, provided by Mr Alexander, were technically accurate and showed that the dwelling's roof access would increase by 3.9 metres and would reach number 46 Hall Lane's upper bedroom window sill;
- The brick wall would be over 22 inches high rising above the fence and would compare to an overbearing building such as a garage;
- There was a risk of light pollution from the proposed velux windows;
- There would be an effect on Mr and Mrs Alexander's quality of life;
- Number 48 Hall Lane had been approached to consider installing a flat roof, but the idea was rejected; and
- The residents at number 46 Hall Lane would not have purchased the house if they had seen that extension.

Following questions to the speakers, Members debated the application and were encouraged by the removal of the proposed high level windows. However, Members raised a number of concerns relating to the adverse impact of the proposed velux windows and light pollution. It was also felt that the proposed additional 2.2 metres on the end of the permitted development would be overbearing for the residents of number 46 Hall Lane.

The Group Manager Development Management advised the Committee that the roof light had not caused a light pollution concern for officers and that if Committee were mindful to refuse the application for that reason then it was unlikely that the case would be successful on an appeal.

The Group Manager Development Management also reminded the Committee that it was not permitted to add any further conditions to the permitted development.

A motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to officer recommendation. The motion was carried by 5 votes, with 2 voting against.

RESOLVED: (5 For, 2 Against) to refuse the application, contrary to officer recommendation.

Reasons for the decision:

The Committee considered that the proposed extension, by virtue of its proximity to the boundary and neighbouring dwelling and its height and length, would have an overbearing impact and it would be of significant detriment to the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal was therefore concluded as being contrary to Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011, and contrary to Policy PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

It was agreed by the Committee that agenda item 4.3 would be taken as the next item of business.

4.2 13/01318/OUT Erection of up to 14 no. dwellings including demolition of 30B Lincoln Road, 30B Lincoln Road, Glington, Peterborough, PE6 7JS

The application site comprised a parcel of agricultural paddock located to the east of dwellings along Lincoln Road, to the north of dwellings along the High Street and to the west of the Glington Doctors Surgery. In addition, the application site included the curtilage of the existing dwelling of No.30B Lincoln Road. The paddock was bound by a number of mature trees and shrubs/hedgerow to the north, south and west and boundary fencing to residential dwellings to the east. The site formed part of a wider parcel of land which was allocated under Policy SA6.9 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012) and was contained wholly within the identified Village Envelope.

To the south of the site lay the Glington Conservation Area which ran along the southern boundary and extended to the east of the site, albeit not with a shared boundary. In addition, there were a number of Grade II Listed Buildings located to the south east.

The application sought outline planning permission for the construction of up to 14 dwellings on the site. The current application sought approval of the proposed vehicular access to the site which would be from Lincoln Road, in place of No.30B Lincoln Road which was proposed for demolition. Matters relating to layout, appearance, landscaping and scale were proposed as 'reserved matters' to be secured at a later date through further submissions.

The application had been accompanied by an indicative site layout and dwelling elevations/floor plans however it was not proposed for these to be agreed under the outline application. The information submitted in this respect had been illustrative only and were not to be used for purposes of detailed assessment of the scheme.

The Group Manager Development Management advised that the update sheet contained information which related to concerns raised by a neighbour regarding traffic calming and vehicle volume increases. In addition the concerns highlighted included the felling of trees which could impact on the bird and bat population.

The officer recommendation was to grant the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

Councillor John Holdich, Ward Councillor and Parish Councillor Robert Johnson addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There had been no issues for the Parish Council relating to how many houses were proposed for the development, however it was disappointing that it was necessary to demolish a house in the process;
- The Parish Council had requested that their preferred maximum height of the

proposed houses be taken on board;

- There were concerns raised over whether the roadway splays were adequate and whether there could be a danger for school children crossing the road;
- The proposed road would be two foot lower than the actual main road;
- Consideration should be given, at reserve matters stage, to the installation of a brick wall either side of the proposed roadway;
- There were concerns raised over the adverse effect that the proposed roadway and development would have on the residents neighbouring the development site;
- Traffic accidents may increase due to the positioning of vehicles maneuvering around the traffic chicanes and turning into the proposed road;
- Access into the proposed road and the verge drops may cause flooding issues running into the estate during heavy snow and rain; and
- The original plan was for the developers to purchase the track down the side of the proposed development. It was felt that the track would provide better access.

Mr Marsh, local resident, addressed the Committee and responded to comments and questions raised.

In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would directly affect the houses at 43, 47 and 49 with vehicle lights projecting into the windows of these properties as they accessed the proposed driveway;
- Vehicles waiting to access the proposed driveway may block number 43, 47 and 49's exit;
- There were existing highways pressure along Lincoln Road in the mornings due to the school drop off times;
- There was a chicane in the road that would force vehicles onto the wrong side of the road when accessing the entrance of the site;
- The old people's home generated a lot of traffic such as ambulances and taxis. The vehicles may stop and reverse into the entrance of the road causing other vehicles to stop abruptly; and
- There may be more than 15 new houses for the proposal, which may cause amenity issues such as pressure on the current sewerage system.

The Senior Engineer (Development), Highway Control responded to comments, concerns and questions raised. In summary responses included:

- Vehicles were already forced into the centre of the road due to the current traffic calming scheme;
- Vehicles driving into the north of the village may experience an impact from cars exiting the proposed road development, this was due to a give way road marking from the south;
- There would be no significant impact relating to increased traffic exiting the proposed driveway. It was envisaged that the impact may be one vehicle every four minutes;
- The responsibility would be with the developers, at the technical appraisal stage under the Highways Act, to find an engineering solution to the road camber issues in terms of drainage and any issues in dealing with road and pathway levels; and
- Lights shining through residents buildings had not caused a concern to highways officers.

A number of Committee Members shared the concerns raised regarding the highways issues including the possible increase in volumes of traffic and the current traffic calming arrangements. Members also felt that consideration should be given to providing alternative access via the track located on the north of the development.

Members requested that consideration be given at reserve matters to mitigate against any disturbance that may be caused to the neighbours in surrounding properties, in particular to number's 32 and 30a, in relation to the site being accessed by vehicles along the proposed roadway.

The Group Manager Development Management advised the Committee that the site allocations document was not prescriptive in terms of where the access road must be placed for the proposed development, however the track was under third party ownership.

The Highways Department had not raised any technical issues in respect of the proposed roadway to the site and there would be no highways technical evidence to support a refusal recommendation by the Committee.

The Group Manager Development Management advised Members that the total access and egress was 19 meters, there had also been a large width available between the edge of the footway and the boundary of the adjacent property to 5 meters. Members were advised that an informative could be included at the reserve matters stage to state that the buffer to the footway should be equal distance in order to assist the developer.

Following clarification from officers, Members were mindful that the proposed access to the site was generous and that the road track which was highlighted had been owned by a third party and refusal of the recommendation may result in land locking the area. It was also felt that the proposed roadway and development site would also benefit from an existing traffic calming system.

A motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application subject the imposition of relevant conditions. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 1 abstaining.

RESOLVED: (6 For, 1 Abstention) to grant the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C17 as detailed in the committee report; and
2. The note to the applicant, IN1, as detailed in the committee report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The application site formed part of a wider allocation under Policy SA6.9 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012) and accordingly, the principle of residential development was acceptable;
- The submitted indicative site layout afforded provision for access to the remaining allocation and as such, would not prejudice future development, in accordance with Policy CS2 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy SA6 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012);
- The demolition of No.30B would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the streetscene along Lincoln Road as it was not of such significance or historical/architectural merit, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The site was of a sufficient size to accommodate the level of development proposed without resulting in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or significance of the Glinton Conservation Area and surrounding locality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policies CS16

- and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposed vehicular access would provide safe access into/out of the site and would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the public highway, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
 - The proposed residential development would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the safety of the surrounding highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
 - The proposed vehicular access would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
 - The site did not contain any protected species and subject to mitigation measures, the proposal would not result in any net loss of biodiversity, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP16 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
 - Adequate surface water and foul drainage would be provided so as to not result in any unacceptable risk of flooding in the locality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
 - Archaeological evaluation would be undertaken to ensure no harm resulted to unidentified buried archaeology, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
 - The development would make a contribution towards the City Council's Environmental Capital Agenda, in accordance with Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011); and
 - The development would make a financial contribution towards the infrastructure demands it generated, in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP14 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

The meeting was adjourned for five minutes.

It was agreed by the Committee that agenda item 4.2 would be taken as the next item of business.

4.3 13/01245/R3FUL - New single storey school comprising of 8 No. classrooms, studio/stage, amenities, play areas, landscaping and parking; and new classroom to existing school and minor alterations to existing school elevations. Land to the rear of 106 – 118A Thistle Moor Road and 1 – 21 Keeton Road, New England/Fulbridge School, Keeton Road, Peterborough

The application was for two developments, one being on each of two separate pieces of land.

The first application site was the Belvedere Bowls Club located to the rear of 106 - 118A Thistle Moor Road and 1- 21 Keeton Road. The site contained two bowling greens and a single storey club hut and pavilion, garages and an area for parking. The site was land locked by residential development to the north west, north east and south west and Accent Nene Sheltered Housing to the south east. Access to the site was currently served off Lincoln Road adjacent to the Parkway Sports Club, through its car park and via a narrow access road which also ran to the south east boundary and separated the site from the rear of properties at 56 to 64 Eaglethorpe. There was also

a pedestrian/cycle path off Thistle Moor Road which had cut across the access road into Eaglesthorpe where it linked with St Pauls Road. The site was enclosed by a mature conifer hedge to a height of approximately two metres to the north west and north east boundaries and there were mature hedges to the south east and south west.

The second application site was the Fulbridge Academy primary school building located on the north east side of Keeton Road in the heart of a residential area. The site contained a single storey brick building to the south west of the site and there was a large playing field to the north east. The school had previously had a number of extensions.

The first application sought permission for the erection of a single storey building to provide eight new classrooms, a studio/performance area and ancillary support spaces. The new building would accommodate years five and six. Parking would be provided for 20 vehicles (staff only) and vehicular access would be gained off Eaglesthorpe and through the adjacent Accent Nene Sheltered Housing Scheme. Pedestrian access to the new school building was proposed to be provided off Burns Close at the intersection of Keeton Road and Shakespeare Avenue. The Belvedere Bowls Club would be relocated to the Peterborough Town Sports Club, Bretton Gate and a separate application for this development was currently under consideration (ref 13/01529/FUL).

The second application sought permission for:

- a) A single storey extension to the existing primary school to provide 1 new classroom. The extension would be located within a recess between two existing classrooms; and
- b) Alterations to windows/doors including the addition of windows to the elevations of the existing classrooms adjacent to the new classroom, insertion of door in reception classroom, insertion of door within the front elevation of the school building.

There were approximately 700 pupils and over 130 staff currently located at the existing school. The proposal would increase the number of pupils by 240 and the number of staff by 20. This meant the total number of classes would progressively expand from the current number of three to four in each year.

The Group Manager Development Management provided an overview of the application and the main issues for consideration. The Committee also received an overview of the revised conditions in addition to the options for retention of a pear tree (ref T7) within the update report. The Officers recommendation was one of approval subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

Members debated the application and raised some concerns over the location of the site, impact of construction, increase in school traffic, parking and the increase in student movement that the school expansion may attract. Members were in favour of the Tree Officer's advice regarding the retention of the pear tree adjacent to the construction entrance and that measures to mitigate any damage to the tree whilst construction was being conducted should be sought.

The Group Manager Development Management clarified that the new class rooms were not 100% self-sufficient and that pupils would need to walk the main body of distance to the school on a regular basis. Members were also advised that schools in the main had adopted a School Travel Plan, which would help to mitigate parking issues that may arise, in addition the area was extensively traffic calmed. There would be noise and disturbance through the construction phase and a mitigation option would be to erect screen planting.

Members continued to debate and felt reassured by the Officer's advice given over Schools Travel Plans. However, there had not a great deal of alternative options available in order to reduce the noise of construction works. Members raised concerns regarding the effect of the relocation of the bowling green and whether it would impact on their 2014 season and asked if there was a condition that could be applied within the application to provide continuity for the event.

The Legal Officer advised that there was no condition that could be imposed to protect the bowling green's 2014 season and that the bowls club were not looking to rescind their lease until such time as to secure an alternative site.

The Group Manager Development Management clarified the emergency access that ran parallel to Thistlemore Road would not be a suitable access option for construction vehicles due to the traffic movement that would be created through busy car parks that served a variety of buildings, which included a sports and social club, a clinic and shops.

A motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions, including revised conditions as detailed in the update report. The motion was carried by 7 votes, with 1 abstaining.

RESOLVED: (7 For, 1 Abstention) to grant the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The Conditions C1 to C17 and C19 as detailed in the committee report;
2. The grant of planning permission for the application for the replacement bowls club, ref. 13/01529/FUL;
3. With the appropriate conditions which reflected whether it had been possible to retain the pear tree ref T7 at the entrance to the new annex school site off Eaglesthorpe i.e. revision to conditions 12 and 7; and
4. The revised conditions as detailed within the update report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable as it had been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The site was located at the heart of a residential area and the proposal would enhance the educational capacity for the catchment area;
- This was a sustainable development which would make efficient and effective use of site;
- The proposal would result in the loss of a sports pitch however, an enhanced bowls club facility on an alternative site could be provided;
- The site would provide safe and convenient access and was accessible by a choice of means of transport and the use of non-car modes of travel would be encouraged through the School Travel Plan;
- The layout, scale, proportions and design of the new building would not detract from the character of the immediate context;
- The siting of the building provided an adequate separation distance to existing neighbouring residential properties and the proposed vehicular access would not result in any adverse effects on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties to an extent that the proposal was unacceptable; and
- The proposal would provide replacement planting and features to enhance the biodiversity within the site.

Hence the proposal accorded with Policies CS14, CS16, CS19, CS21 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP12, PP13 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

1.30pm – 3.14pm
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank